

Mr. Shankaranarayana Rao having resigned his membership in the Legislative Council, Mr. C. S. Doraswamy Iyer took part in the discussions having been previously invited to be present.

P. RAGHAVENDRA RAO,

K. CHANDY,

P. G. D'SOUZA,

D. VENKATESAYYA.

(Subject to a minute of dissent.)

Mr. H. Krishna Rao was unable to be present at the meeting.

*Minute of dissent.*

I have signed the report, subject to certain reservations in respect of clauses 6 and 7 of the Bill, in the manner indicated below:—

(1) It appears to me that the restrictions and limitations placed upon the powers of the Local Boards to form Sub-Committees and Special-Committees, under the new Section 17 A in clause 6 of the Bill, are not in keeping with the liberal spirit of the Local Self-Government Scheme in Mysore (*vide* G. O. No. 3005-55—Ml. 132-16-1, dated 16th November 1916). If the economic progress intended to be attained by the devolution of powers and functions on the Local Boards under the Government Orders is to be real and substantial, I am strongly of opinion that the Taluk Board must, at once be recognised unhesitatingly as an autonomous unit and not merely as an agent of the District Board, for all purposes of action as well as for exercising the powers of taxation. In this view of the matter, it becomes necessary to further amend Section 17A, clause (2) and clause (3) so as to leave the powers of the Taluk Board unfettered by unnecessary interference by the District Boards or its President.

(2) In respect of clause 7, I desire to state that my view is that land is already overburdened by taxation. It is therefore necessary that "Land Revenue" should not be made liable to further taxation by the Local Boards. Again, for the reasons stated above, I am strongly of opinion that it is the Taluk Boards, and not the District Boards, that should be made competent to levy the Education Cess. The proposed section in clause 7 of the Bill, will, in this view, have its proper place under Section 26 of the Mysore Local Board and Village Panchayets Regulation, 1918, after the necessary changes being made in it.

Though I was not able to convince the official members of the Select Committee of the reasonableness of my arguments in support of the views I hold, I wish to express my appreciation of the extreme courtesy and considerations with which they discussed all these matters.

D. VENKATESAYYA,

*Member, Mysore Legislative Council.*

No. 827—L. C., dated 8th June 1920.

Under Rule 40 of the rules for the conduct of business of the Mysore Legislative Council the following report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend the Mysore Municipal Regulation, 1906, is published for general information.

By Order,

P. MAHADEVAYYA,

*Secretary, Mysore Legislative Council.*

**Report of the Select Committee on the Bill further to amend  
the Mysore Municipal Regulation, 1906.**

We the members of the Select Committee appointed to consider the above Bill, have the honor to submit the following Report:—

*Clause 1.*—This clause as it stands at present makes the function of economic work only optional on the part of municipalities. Likewise Section 30 provides for consultative committees only. As the object of the Government Order dated 12th July 1919, regarding the reconstitution of the Economic Conference is to make it obligatory for municipalities to undertake economic development work, we propose that instead of amending Section 30, a new section be added as Section 29A and that a new clause (t) be also inserted under Section 54. The new section and the new clause may be worded as follows:—

"29A. Subject to such rules as may be framed by the Government from time to time in this behalf, the Municipal Council shall appoint for the purpose of Section 54 (t) three committees to deal respectively with Education, Agriculture and Industries and Commerce."

"54 (t) promoting the development of economic condition with special reference to Education, Agriculture and Industries and Commerce."

*Clauses 2, 3 and 4.*—In view of the alterations indicated above, there is no need to consider Mr. H. Krishna Rao's amendment; Clauses 2, 3 and 4 have to be omitted, and Clause (p) of Section 54 and Clause (c) of Section 56 have to be deleted.

*Clause 6.*—We recommend that the word "and organisations" may be omitted, as organisations other than Local Boards and Village Panchayets have no statutory existence under the Regulation, and we consider that the relations between these bodies could more appropriately be defined by an executive Order of Government.

We recommend that the Bill may be passed with the alterations noted above, and as we have indicated the changes in detail, we consider that the Bill need not be republished.

Mr. Shankaranarayana Rao, having resigned his membership in the Legislative Council, Mr. C. S. Doraswamy Iyer took part in the discussions having been previously invited to be present.

P. RAGHAVENDRA RAO,  
P. G. D'SOUZA,  
M. C. RANGIENGAR,  
B. V. RAMASWAMY CHETTY.

NOTE.—Bao Sahob H. Channaiya and Mr. Mahomed Abbas Khan were unable to be present at the meeting.